



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/780,830 | 02/18/2004 | Neal S. Bergano | Bergano-20-CIP4 | 3768 |

7590 01/31/2008
Donald J. Perreault
Grossman, Tucker, Perreault & Pfleger, PLLC
55 South Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

WANG, QUAN ZHEN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2613

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|
|-----------|---------------|

01/31/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/780,830 | BERGANO, NEAL S. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Quan-Zhen Wang | 2613 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Quan-Zhen Wang. (3) _____

(2) Donald J. Perreault. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sano.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative claimed that the prior art reference is different from the invention in that the invention comprising selectively adjusting a depth of periodic modulation of the intensity of the optical signal, arguing that the signal is always on in a given slot. Examiner pointed out that applicant does not differentiate the claim from the prior art references. The prior art reference selectively changes the modulation "duty ratio" which in turn changes the modulation depth of periodic modulation of the intensity of the optical signal. Therefore, the prior art references reads on the claim of the application with its broadest reasonable interpretation.